

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-24 remain pending in the case. Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-24 are rejected.

### 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 5,483,262 by Izutani, hereinafter referred to as the "Izutani" reference, in view of United States Patent in view of United States Patent 5,067,573 by Uchida, hereinafter referred to as the "Uchida" reference. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10 and 17 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the combination of Izutani and Uchida.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A computer system comprising:  
a processor coupled to a bus;  
a memory unit coupled to said bus;  
a display screen coupled to said bus;  
a digitizer coupled to said bus;  
a case for supporting said processor, said memory unit,  
said display screen and said digitizer, said case having a slot  
located therein for receiving a stylus, wherein said slot comprises  
an opening at one end of said slot for receiving said stylus;

a non-mechanical detector for detecting said stylus in said slot;

a switch coupled to said non-mechanical detector for generating a signal to power up said processor, said display screen and said digitizer when said stylus is removed from said slot and wherein said switch is also for generating a signal to place said processor, said display screen and said digitizer into a power conservation mode when said stylus is inserted into said slot.

Independent Claim 10 recites similar limitations. Claims 4, 5, and 7 that depend from independent Claim 1 and Claims 16 and 17 that depend from independent Claim 10 provide further limitations of the features of the present invention.

Izutani does not teach or suggest a computer system comprising a slot for receiving a stylus wherein the slot has an opening at one end of the slot for receiving a stylus. On the contrary, Izutani teaches a pen-input device wherein the pen holder for receiving a pen has an opening that runs along the entire length of the pen holder. In particular, the pen holder of Izutani pen holder includes an upper pen holding portion and a lower pen holding portion (see Izutani col. 3, lines 7-12; and Figures 2a-c, elements 2, 4 and 5). Applicants understand Izutani to teach a pen holder for holding an input pen between an upper pen holding portion and a lower pen holding portion.

As described in the present invention, a method and device are provided for detecting a stylus based on a non-mechanical detector. Specifically, the

present invention as claimed recites the limitation of a computer system comprising a non-mechanical detector for detecting a stylus in a slot, wherein the slot has an opening at one end for receiving the stylus, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 10. Specifically, Figures 2A, 2B, 3, 7 and 8 illustrate a slot having an opening at one end for receiving the stylus.

In contrast, Izutani teaches a pen-input type information processor including a pen holder 2 including an upper pen holding portion 4 and a lower pen holding portion 5 (Figures 2a-c). The input pen 1 is held in between upper pen holding portion 4 and lower pen holding portion 5. In particular, pen holder 2 does not have an opening at one end for receiving input pen 1. Rather, the pen holder of Izutani has an upper pen holding portion 4 at one end and a lower pen holding portion 5 at the other end.

Applicants respectfully submit that Izutani does not teach or suggest a slot having an opening at one end as claimed, because such a reading would render the claims of Izutani inoperable. In particular, the pen holder of Izutani would be inoperable with an opening at one end. For example, if either the upper pen holding portion or the lower pen holding portion were replaced with an opening, the input pen would not be held on place, as only one support would remain. Furthermore, Izutani specifically teaches that “[p]en holder 2 includes an upper pen holding portion 4 and a lower pen holding portion 5, and input pen 1 is held therebetween.” On the contrary, by requiring an upper pen

holding portion and a lower pen holding portion, Izutani teaches away from such operation. Applicants refer Examiner to Examiner Interview Summary of the Response and Amendment filed on September 16, 2003 for further explanation.

Moreover, the combination of Izutani and Uchida fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Uchida does not overcome the shortcomings of Izutani. Uchida, alone or in combination with Izutani, does not show or suggest a computer system comprising a non-mechanical detector for detecting a stylus in a slot, wherein the slot has an opening at one end for receiving the stylus. As described above, Izutani teaches a pen-input type information processor including a pen holder comprising an upper pen holding portion and a lower pen holding portion.

Applicants understand Uchida to teach a hand-writing input apparatus having an opening at one end of a slot for receiving an input pen. As described above, modifying Izutani to have a pen holder with an opening at one end, as shown in Uchida, would render Izutani inoperable. Therefore, in view of the claim limitation of a computer system comprising a non-mechanical detector for detecting a stylus in a slot, wherein the slot has an opening at one end for receiving the stylus not being shown or suggested in Izutani and Uchida, in combination with the above arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that

independent Claims 1 and 10 overcomes the cited references and is therefore allowable over the combination of Izutani and Uchida.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Izutani and Uchida teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1 and 10, and that these claims are thus in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit the combination of Izutani and Uchida also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 4, 5, 7, 16 and 17. Claims 4, 5, and 7 are dependent on allowable base Claim 1, and Claims 16 and 17 are dependent on allowable base Claim 10. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4, 5, 7, 16 and 17 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims.

Claims 3, 6, 11 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Izutani and Uchida, further in view of United States Patent 6,100,538 by Ogawa et al., hereinafter referred to as the "Ogawa" reference. Claims 3 and 6 are dependent on Claim 1, and Claims 11, and 13-15 are dependent on Claim 10. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 3, 6, 11 and 13-15 are not unpatentable over Izutani and Uchida, further in view Ogawa, for the following rationale.

As described above, Izutani teaches a pen-input type information processor including a pen holder comprising an upper pen holding portion and a lower pen holding portion and Uchida teaches a hand-writing input apparatus having an opening at one end of a slot for receiving an input pen. Modifying Izutani to have a pen holder with an opening at one end, as shown in Uchida, would render Izutani inoperable. The combination of Izutani, Uchida and Ogawa fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Ogawa does not overcome the shortcomings of Izutani and Uchida. The combination of Izutani, Uchida and Ogawa would require the above described modification of Izutani, rendering Izutani inoperable.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Izutani, Uchida and Ogawa teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1 and 10, and that these claims are thus in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit the combination of Izutani, Uchida and Ogawa also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 3, 6, 11 and 13-15. Claims 3 and 6 are dependent on allowable base Claim 1, and Claims 11 and 13-15 are dependent on allowable base Claim 10. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3, 6, 11 and 13-15 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as these claims are dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Izutani and Uchida, further in view of United States Patent 5,049,862 by Dao et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Dao” reference. Claim 8 is dependent on allowable base Claim 1. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiment of the present invention as recited in Claim 8 is not unpatentable over Izutani and Uchida, further in view Dao, for the following rationale.

As described above, Izutani teaches a pen-input type information processor including a pen holder comprising an upper pen holding portion and a lower pen holding portion and Uchida teaches a hand-writing input apparatus having an opening at one end of a slot for receiving an input pen. Modifying Izutani to have a pen holder with an opening at one end, as shown in Uchida, would render Izutani inoperable. The combination of Izutani, Uchida and Dao fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Dao does not overcome the shortcomings of Izutani and Uchida. The combination of Izutani, Uchida and Dao would require the above described modification of Izutani, rendering Izutani inoperable.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Izutani, Uchida and Dao teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claim 1, and that this claim is thus in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit the combination of Izutani,

Uchida and Dao also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claim 8 dependent on allowable base Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 8 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as this claim is dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Izutani and Uchida, further in view of United States Patent 5,756,941 by Snell. Claim 9 is dependent on allowable base Claim 1. Claim 9 is dependent on allowable base Claim 1. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiment of the present invention as recited in Claim 9 is not unpatentable over Izutani and Uchida, further in view Snell, for the following rationale.

As described above, Izutani teaches a pen-input type information processor including a pen holder comprising an upper pen holding portion and a lower pen holding portion and Uchida teaches a hand-writing input apparatus having an opening at one end of a slot for receiving an input pen. Modifying Izutani to have a pen holder with an opening at one end, as shown in Uchida, would render Izutani inoperable. The combination of Izutani, Uchida and Snell fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Dao does not overcome the shortcomings of Izutani and Uchida. The combination of Izutani, Uchida



and Snell would require the above described modification of Izutani, rendering Izutani inoperable.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Izutani, Uchida and Snell teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claim 1, and that this claim is thus in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit the combination of Izutani, Uchida and Snell also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claim 9 dependent on allowable base Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 9 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as this claim is dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 18-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Izutani in view of Uchida. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 18-21 and 23 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the combination of Izutani and Uchida.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 18 which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A computer system comprising:  
a processor coupled to a bus;  
a memory unit coupled to said bus;  
a display screen coupled to said bus;  
a digitizer coupled to said bus;  
a case for supporting said processor, said memory unit,  
said display screen and said digitizer, said case having a slot  
located therein for receiving a hinge attached to a protective cover;  
a non-mechanical detector for detecting positions of said  
hinge within said slot;  
a switch coupled to said non-mechanical detector for  
generating a signal to automatically power up said processor,  
said display screen and said digitizer when said hinge is rotated  
such that said cover is not laid over said display screen and  
wherein said switch is also for generating a signal to  
automatically place said processor, said display screen and said  
digitizer into a power conservation mode when said hinge is  
rotated such that said cover is laid over said display screen.

Claims 19-21 and 23 that depend from independent Claim 18 provide further limitations of the features of the present invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Izutani does not show, teach or suggest a computer system comprising a slot for receiving a hinge attached to a protective cover, a non-mechanical detector for detecting a position of a hinge, and a switch for controlling power based on a position of a hinge, as claimed. In particular, Izutani makes no reference at all to a hinge.

Moreover, the combination of Izutani and Uchida fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Uchida does not overcome the shortcomings of Izutani. Uchida, alone or in combination with Izutani, does not show or suggest a computer system comprising a non-mechanical detector for detecting a

stylus in a slot, wherein the slot has an opening at one end for receiving the stylus. As described above, Izutani teaches a pen-input type information processor including a pen holder comprising an upper pen holding portion and a lower pen holding portion.

Applicants respectfully submit that Uchida does not show, teach or suggest a non-mechanical detector for detecting a position of a hinge, and a switch for controlling power based on a position of a hinge, as claimed. Referring to Figure 1, Uchida teaches a hinge member 9 for hingedly securing cover 6 to case 2 (col. 2, lines 46-47). When cover 6 is closed, switch 17 shuts off the power source (col. 3, lines 19-24). In particular, the power is not based on a position of hinge 9, and is in no way related to any hinge.

In contrast, embodiments of the claimed invention are directed towards a computer system comprising “a non-mechanical detector for detecting positions of said hinge within said slot.” Rotating the hinge can directly control the power mode of the computer system. As described in the present application, “[w]hen rotated to cover, the switch automatically powers down the computer” and “[w]hen rotated out for computer use, the switch automatically powers up the computer” (page , lines 10-14).

Applicants respectfully submit that Uchida does not teach or suggest a “non-mechanical detector for detecting positions of said hinge within said slot”,

as claimed. In contrast, Uchida teaches a power switch that is activated by coming in contact with a cover.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Izutani and Uchida teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claim 18, and that this claim is thus in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit the combination of Izutani and Uchida also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 19-21 and 23. Claims 19-21 and 23 are dependent on allowable base Claim 18. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 19-21 and 23 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Izutani and Uchida, further in view of Ogawa. Claim 22 is dependent on allowable base Claim 18. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiment of the present invention as recited in Claim 22 is not unpatentable over Izutani and Uchida, further in view Ogawa, for the following rationale.

As described above, Izutani makes no reference at all to a hinge. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Uchida does not show, teach or suggest a non-mechanical detector for detecting a position of a hinge, and a

switch for controlling power based on a position of a hinge, as claimed. The combination of Izutani, Uchida and Ogawa fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Ogawa does not overcome the shortcomings of Izutani and Uchida. Applicants understand Ogawa to teach an optical digitizer. In particular, Ogawa does not teach, describe or suggest a non-mechanical detector for detecting a position of a hinge, and a switch for controlling power based on a position of a hinge, as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Izutani, Uchida and Ogawa teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claim 18, and that this claim is thus in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit the combination of Izutani, Uchida and Ogawa also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claim 22 dependent on allowable base Claim 18. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 22 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as this claim is dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Izutani and Uchida, further in view of Dao. Claim 24 is dependent on allowable base Claim 18. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiment of the present

invention as recited in Claim 24 is not unpatentable over Izutani and Uchida, further in view Dao, for the following rationale.

As described above, Izutani makes no reference at all to a hinge. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Uchida does not show, teach or suggest a non-mechanical detector for detecting a position of a hinge, and a switch for controlling power based on a position of a hinge, as claimed. The combination of Izutani, Uchida and Dao fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Dao does not overcome the shortcomings of Izutani and Uchida. Applicants understand Dao to teach a keyless flat panel portable computer. In particular, Dao does not teach, describe or suggest a non-mechanical detector for detecting a position of a hinge, and a switch for controlling power based on a position of a hinge, as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Izutani, Uchida and Dao teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claim 18, and that this claim is thus in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit the combination of Izutani, Uchida and Dao also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claim 24 dependent on allowable base Claim 18. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 24 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as this claim is dependent on an allowable base claim.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the amendments and arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-24 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 14 June, 2004



Matthew J. Blecher  
Registration No. 46,558

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060